

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	LICATION NO. FILING DATE			FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/051,511		01/18/2002	,	Richard M. Palmer	341-01	1626
27569	7590	09/20/2004			EXAMINER	
PAUL AND PAUL 2900 TWO THOUSAND MARKET STREET					WEINSTEIN, STEVEN L	
		A, PA 19103			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1761		
					DATE MAILED: 09/20/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

the state of the s	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/051,511	PALMER ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
-	Steven L. Weinstein	1761
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	1	
Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period version of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 M	lay 2004.	
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)□ This	action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	lti resuirement	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.	
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).
<ul> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority document</li> </ul>	ts have been received	
<ul><li>1. Certified copies of the priority documen</li><li>2. Certified copies of the priority documen</li></ul>		tion No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price		
application from the International Burea		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	t of the certified copies not receiv	red.
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summar	y (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail [	Date
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Patent Application (PTO-152)
raper No(S)/Niail Date	, —	

Application/Control Number: 10/051,511

**Art Unit: 1761** 

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Candy Industry (7/95) Snack Food (4/95) and Product Alert (9/19/94), in view of Booth ('011), Ingber ('905), Batchlet. ('144), Jackson ('925), and Schiller ('164) in view of St. Paul Pioneer Press Dispatch (7/16/89), Wichita Eagle (2/01/99), Stazo ('654) and Rosskam ('301). The claims are also rejected employing Booth, Ingber, Batchlet, Jackson and Schiller first and the claims are also rejected employing Booth first as discussed in the Office action mailed (January 27, 2004). The claims are rejected for the reasons give in the Office action mailed January 27, 2004.

All of applicants' remarks filed May 26, 2004 have been fully and carefully considered but are not found to be convincing. Contrary to what has been urged, the Office action mailed January 27, 2004, fully and clearly details the reasoning behind the 35USC 103 rejection. The references are described as to what they teach and why the references are properly combinable. In view of the preponderance of the evidence, it would have been an obvious matter of design to simulate the shape and appearance of a real life tackle box employing conventional candy shaped to look like tackle and a box having a conventional tackle box appearance. This evidence, as fully detailed in the last Office action, includes a candy tackle box with candy having the appearance of

Application/Control Number: 10/051,511

Art Unit: 1761

tackle, other candy having the appearance of other real-life objects in containers having the appearance of those real-life boxes that the contents come in, etc.

Finally, applicants appear to question the number of references that have been applied. Patentability is not predicated on the number of references applied, but what the art taken as a whole teaches. See in this regard In re Gorman 18 USPQ 1886.

Note too, that the Court pointed out that where teachings relied upon to show obviousness were repeated in a number of references, the conclusion of obviousness was strengthened.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven L. Weinstein whose telephone number is (571)

Application/Control Number: 10/051,511

Art Unit: 1761

Page 4

272-1410. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on (571) 272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

S.L. Weinstein/dh August 24, 2004

> STEVE WEINSTEIN PRIMARY EXAMINER 176